

# MEMORANDUM

January 12, 2007

**TO:** Bob Pemberton, Senior Planner  
Planning and Development Services

**FROM:** Andrew Smith, Transportation Development Reviewer  
Planning and Development Services

**SUBJECT:** File No. 05-123050-SD – Horseman's Trail  
Final Transportation Comments

---

The Department of Planning and Development Services (PDS) has reviewed the subject development proposal for compliance with Chapter 30.66B SCC, Title 13 SCC, Snohomish County Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS), and the appropriate policies and procedures on behalf of the Department of Public Works (PW). Based on this review, PDS has the following comments.

## BACKGROUND

- The developer proposes to subdivide a 21.38-acre parcel into 116 lots. There are currently no single family residences (SFR) located on the site. Duplexes are not proposed.
- The subject property is located west of Picnic Point Road at 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West in Transportation Service Area (TSA) D, inside the urban growth area.
- The plan used for this review was received by Planning and Development Services (PDS) December 26, 2006.
- The development is subject to the requirements of the amended version of SCC 30.66B that became effective **November 17, 2003**.
- Based on this review, the department finds that the information enclosed is adequate to make a favorable recommendation for this proposal.

## NOTICE REQUIREMENTS FOR CONCURRENCY DETERMINATION AND IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION

Notice of Concurrency Determination. The following language should be included in the notice of public hearing for this development.

“The Department of Public Works has evaluated the traffic impacts of this development under the provisions of Chapter 30.66B SCC, and the development has been deemed concurrent. Any person aggrieved by the concurrency determination for this development may submit written documentation at, or prior to, the public hearing advertised above, explaining why the concurrency determination fails to satisfy the requirements of Chapter 30.66B SCC.”

Notice of Impact Fee Determination. The following language should be included in the notice of public hearing for this development.

“Traffic impact fees have been determined, and the fee amounts are available in the project file. Any aggrieved person may appeal the decision applying an impact fee under Chapter 30.66B SCC to the Snohomish County Hearing Examiner by submitting a written appeal to Planning and Development Services, in the manner and form prescribed by Chapter 2.02, within 14 days of the date of this notice.”

## **CHAPTER 30.66B SCC REQUIRES DEVELOPER MITIGATION FOR IMPACTS ON:**

### **1. Road System Capacity [SCC 30.66B.310]**

The impact fee for this proposal is based on the new average daily trips (ADT) generated by 116 new SFRs, which is 9.57 ADT/SFR. This rate comes from the 7<sup>th</sup> Edition of the ITE Trip Generation Report (Land Use Code 210). The project will receive a 5 percent credit toward the traffic impact fee because the applicant has submitted an acceptable TDM plan. The development will generate 1,054.61 new ADT and has a road system capacity impact fee of \$238,341.86, based on \$226.00/ADT. The impact fee for each SFR is \$2,054.67. This impact fee must be paid prior to issuance of the building permit.

The ADT has been calculated as follows:  $116 \text{ SFR} \times 9.57 \text{ ADT/SFR} \times 0.95 = 1,054.61 \text{ ADT}$   
The PM PHT has been calculated as follows:  $116 \text{ SFR} \times 1.01 \text{ PM PHT/SFR} \times 0.95 = 111.30 \text{ PM PHT}$   
The AM PHT has been calculated as follows:  $116 \text{ SFR} \times 0.75 \text{ AM PHT/SFR} \times 0.95 = 82.65 \text{ AM PHT}$

### **2. Concurrency [SCC 30.66B.120]**

The subject development has been evaluated for concurrency under the provisions of SCC 30.66B.120 and the Department of Public Works has made a preliminary determination that:

The development is concurrent as of June 8, 2006.

A record of developer obligations documenting the concurrency determination will be prepared by DPW in accordance with the provisions of SCC 30.66B.070. The expiration date of the concurrency determination will be six years from June 8, 2006.

At the request of the DPW, the applicant's traffic engineer performed a future level of service analysis dated October 19, 2005 of Picnic Point Road including the impact of this development. The results of the evaluation indicated that the arterial unit will operate at an acceptable level of service under future conditions.

The development has been deemed concurrent on the following basis:

Large-Sized Development in TSA with one or more arterial unit(s) in arrears, SCC 30.66B.130(4). The subject development is located in TSA D which, as of the date of submittal, had the following arterial units in arrears: Unit # 202, Seattle Hill Road between 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE and 132<sup>nd</sup> Street SE and Unit #240, 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE between 168<sup>th</sup> Street SE and Seattle Hill Road. Based on peak-hour trip distributions, the subject development will

NOT add three (3) or more peak-hour trips to any of the arterial units in arrears. The development generates 82.65 a.m. peak-hour trips and 111.30 p.m. peak-hour trips which is MORE than the threshold of 50 peak-hour trips, and thus, the development has also been evaluated under SCC 30.66B.035. Pursuant to SCC 30.66B.035, the applicant has evaluated the future level-of-service on the road system consistent with the specific traffic study requirements imposed by the Department of Public Works and has found that there ARE one or more arterial units in arrears in the TSA based on forecast level-of-service conditions but the development will NOT impact any of them with three or more peak-hour trips and the development is deemed concurrent under SCC 30.66B.160 (2)(a)

### **3. Inadequate Road Condition (IRC) [SCC 30.66B.210]**

The subject proposal will not impact any IRC locations identified at this time within TSA D with three or more of its p.m. peak hour trips, nor will it create any. Therefore, it is anticipated that mitigation will not be required with respect to inadequate road conditions and no restrictions to building permit issuance or certificate of occupancy/final inspection will be imposed under this section of Chapter 30.66B.

### **4. Frontage Improvements [SCC 30.66B.410]**

The subject property frontage is located at the end of 58<sup>th</sup> Place W and 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue W. No frontage improvements will be required of this development. Construction of frontage improvements is required prior to recording of the final plat unless bonding of improvements is allowed by PDS, in which case construction is required prior to any occupancy of the development.

### **5. Access and Circulation [SCC 30.66B.420]**

Access is proposed from 58<sup>th</sup> Place West and 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West. There appears to be an existing house on the northwest corner of the intersection of 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West and 136<sup>th</sup> Place SW located immediately outside of the proposed development of Horseman's Trail that is located closer to the right-of-way than is permitted by code. The applicant is proposing the extension of 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West to be moved eastward away from the house. The distance of the road right-of-way will be 12 feet and the distance of the new proposed road will be 17 feet from the existing house.

60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West does not meet EDDS for vertical curves, slope and design speed. A deviation was approved by the County Engineer on January 8, 2007 for slope, stopping and intersection sight distance along 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West. A deviation was approved by the County Engineer on September 2, 2005 for a modified design for sidewalks and planters throughout the proposed development. The deviation was conditioned that the walkways must not have stairs, and that mail boxes shall be provided at locations served by the pedestrian trail system. Back yards adjacent to the trail system also must not be fenced or a gate must be provided from each lot to the trail system. A public easement shall be provided for any part of the trail system serving the public road.

A deviation was approved by the County Engineer on June 2, 2006 for a slope of 15 percent at two locations along 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West. A deviation was approved by the County Engineer on

January 8, 2007 for a 20 mph design speed based on the following conditions. Street lighting shall be installed at the sag curves along 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West to provide adequate stopping and intersection sight distance for night driving.

A private road is proposed to connect to 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West approximately half way up the hill. The private road is acceptable to DPW.

#### **6. Dedication of Right-of-Way [SCC 30.66B.510, SCC 30.66B.520]**

60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West is designated as a non-arterial on the County's Arterial Circulation Map. This requires a right-of-way width of 30 feet on each side of the right-of-way centerline. 20 feet and 15 feet of right-of-way presently exist on the development's side of the right-of-way. Therefore, 25 feet of additional right-of-way is required to make 60 feet of total right-of-way along 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West and 58<sup>th</sup> Place West. The applicant has proposed 46 feet along 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West which is acceptable to DPW and 35 feet of right-of-way along the remaining internal public roads, which are acceptable to DPW. Portions of 58<sup>th</sup> Place West are required to be vacated for the current proposal. In addition, it appears that a portion of 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West and 136<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW within Tract 999 will need to be vacated as the tract will be part of the private development or remove the right-of-way from the tract. Vacation of 58<sup>th</sup> Place SW, 136<sup>th</sup> Street SW and 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West is required to approve the proposed development.

#### **7. State Highway Impacts [SCC 30.66B.710]**

This development is subject to the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)/County Inter-local Agreement (ILA) which became effective on applications determined complete on or after December 21, 1997.

The impact mitigation measures under the ILA, Section IV(4.1)(b), may be accomplished through a) voluntary negotiated construction of improvements, b) voluntary negotiated payment in lieu of construction, c) transfer of land from the developer to the State, or d) a voluntary payment in the amount of \$36.00 per ADT.

A voluntary offer, acceptable to the State, signed the applicant indicating their chosen method of fulfilling their mitigation requirement under the ILA, is required prior to providing a final recommendation. A voluntary offer to WSDOT was received by PDS on August 8, 2005. Comments from WSDOT accepting the offer were received by PDS on August 30, 2005. The offer was toward WSDOT Project No. DOT-11 (128<sup>th</sup> Street SW at I-5), which is projected to be impacted by 89 ADT at a rate of \$113.00/ADT for a total offer of \$10,096.16.

#### **8. Other Streets and Roads [SCC 30.66B.720]**

Based on the data submitted by the applicant it is unlikely that other city streets or roads, within TSA D that have an inter-local agreement with Snohomish County, will be affected by this development. To mitigate impacts on roads under the jurisdiction of another agency, the document stating the mitigation requirements imposed shall be a voluntary agreement between the other jurisdiction and the developer.

## **9. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) [SCC 30.66B.630]**

All new developments in the urban area shall provide transportation demand management measures. Sufficient transportation demand management measures shall be provided to indicate the potential for removing a minimum of five (5) percent of a development's P.M. peak hour trips from the road system. This requirement shall be met by the provisions of site design requirements under SCC 30.66B.640, as applicable, except where the development proposes construction or purchase of specific offsite TDM measures or voluntary payment in lieu of site design, in accordance with SCC 30.66B.620 and 30.66B.625.

It has been determined that the cost of removing one peak hour trip from the road system is approximately \$1,500. This is based on the average cost of one stall in a park and ride lot and the average cost of one "seat" in a 15-passenger van. For a development required to provide TDM, the development's TDM obligation will equal \$1,500 times the required trip reduction percentage times the development's peak hour trip generation. [SCC 30.66B.615]

The trip reduction percentage for this development is five percent. The TDM obligation for this development is therefore equivalent to 5% of the 117.16 new PM peak hour trips x \$1,500.00 which equals \$8,787.00. A TDM plan was submitted during the previous submittal that DPW did not receive. The TDM plan submitted is acceptable. No additional TDM is required.

## **PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES [RCW 58.17.110]**

The county is required to make findings regarding safe walking conditions for school children who may reside in the subject development. Public Works requests notification of any and all comments received from the local school district regarding the location of school bus stops nearest the subject property and/or if any school children will be required to walk to school. Comments from the school district were received by PDS on December 1, 2005. The school district indicated that the high school and middle school students will be picked up at the intersection of Picnic Point Road and 136<sup>th</sup> Place SW or 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West and 140<sup>th</sup> Street SW. The school district indicated that the elementary school students will walk to Picnic Point Elementary located at the intersection of 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West and 140<sup>th</sup> Street SW. Adequate pedestrian facilities are required from the houses in the development to the bus stop and elementary school locations. A 7-foot paved shoulder shall be constructed along the east side of 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West from the developments southern extent to 140<sup>th</sup> Street SW as a condition of this development.

A public easement is required for the walkway system that will serve the public road within the proposed development.

**The DPW has no objections to the approval of the subject subdivision as shown on the plat received by PDS on December 26, 2006, provided the following is completed as a pre-condition:**

1. Vacation of unopened right-of-way within the development along the alignment of 58<sup>th</sup> Place SW, 136<sup>th</sup> Street SW and 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West.

**The DPW has no objections to the approval of the subject subdivision as shown on the plat received by PDS on December 26, 2006, provided the following is indicated on the face of the final plat:**

30.66B SCC requires the new lot mitigation payments in the amounts shown below for a single-family residence (SFR)

<p>\$2,054.67 per lot for mitigation of impacts on county roads paid to the county, \$87.04 per lot for impacts to WSDOT project DOT-11 (128<sup>th</sup> Street SW at I-5) paid to the county,</p>
---

These payments are due prior to or at the time of building permit issuance for each SFR. Notice of these mitigation payments shall be contained in any deeds involving this subdivision or the lots therein. Once building permits have been issued all mitigation payments shall be deemed paid by PDS.

**The DPW has no objections to the approval of the subject plat as shown on the plat received by PDS on December 26, 2006, provided the following is completed prior to the issuance of a construction permit:**

1. A TDM plan shall have been incorporated into the construction drawings to the specifications of DPW.
2. An off-site walkway shall have been incorporated into the construction drawings to the specifications of DPW.
3. The modified walkways throughout the development shall have been incorporated in the construction plans the conditions provided in the approved deviation to the specifications of DPW.

**The DPW has no objections to the approval of the subject plat as shown on the plat received by PDS on December 26, 2006, provided the following is completed prior to the recording of the plat:**

1. Adequate luminaires shall be placed along 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West to achieve sight distance at night to the specifications of the DPW [SCC 30.66B.410].
2. The TDM plan shall have been implemented.
3. A 7-foot paved shoulder shall be constructed along the east side of 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue West from the developments southern extent to 140<sup>th</sup> Street SW to the specifications of the DPW [EDDS].

4. A deviation was approved by the County Engineer on September 2, 2005 for a modified design for sidewalks and planters throughout the proposed development. The deviation was conditioned that the walkways must not have stairs, and that mail boxes shall be provided at locations served by the pedestrian trail system. Back yards adjacent to the trail system also must not be fenced or a gate must be provided from each lot to the trail system.
5. A public easement shall be provided for any part of the trail system serving the public road.

cc: Deb Werdal, Land Development Analyst Assoc.